DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 623 SP 009 246

AUTHOR McKee, Helen C.; And Others
TITLE Hamburg Center Intern Follow-Up.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Fredonia. Coll. at Fredonia. Teacher Education Research Center.
NOTE 29p.; For related document, see SP 009 264

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Follow Up Studies; Job Market; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Opinion; *Student Reaction; *Student Teachers; Teacher Background; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Interns

ABSTRACT

This study presents an evaluation by student teachers of a one-year internship program initiated in 1972 in the Hamburg central school system. The Teacher Education Research Center (TERC) program was field-centered and competency-based, and provided the opportunity to develop teaching competencies in 12 categories. The evaluation instrument was designed to determine the effects of the program on the attitudes, academic backgrounds, employment prospects, and professional growth of interns. The four-part questionnaire covered the following topics: (a) college-related information, (b) TERC-related information, (c) employment information, and (d) personal comments. Each section is individually presented and the results examined. Section 1 lists colleges attended by the interns, areas of study, and reasons for choosing the TERC program. Section 2 focuses on TERC activities and how they were rated by the interns on a three-point scale. Section 3 discusses student use of the placement office and job opportunities. Section 4 presents comments by the interns on the program, teaching methods, and faculty. (Appendixes include a listing of colleges attended by interns, teaching assignments, and a sample questionnaire.) (Author/JS)

ED107623

HAMBURG CENTER INTERN FOLLOW-UP

Helen C. McKee

Gerald T. Holmes

Lois D. Jones

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Teacher Education Research Center

State University College

Fredonia, New York

SP009 246

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword i

Chapter

1 Introduction 1

2 The Study 3

Section One: College-Related Information . . 3

Section Two: Center-Related Information . . 7

Section Three: Employment Information . . . 13

Section Four: Personal Comments 17

3 Retrospect 19

Appendices

Appendix A, Colleges Attended 20

Appendix B, Teaching Assignments 20

Appendix C, Questionnaire 21

Foreword

This Hamburg Center Intern Follow-up was undertaken to provide another means of assessing the Hamburg project by soliciting the reactions of the interns.

The interest and recommendations of Dr. Daniel W. Wheeler, Coordinator, Hamburg Teaching Center, and the Hamburg staff were much appreciated. Editorial assistance was given by Dr. Ronald E. Hull.

The investigators are grateful to the secretaries, Mrs. Marian Anderson and Mrs. Gertrude Reep, for typing assistance and the preparation of the final copy.

Special recognition must be given the interns who took the time and made the effort to respond to the questionnaire.

Kenneth G. Nelson, Director
Teacher Education Research Center
State University College
Fredonia, New York 14063

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the Fall of 1972, a small group of seniors from State University College (SUC), Fredonia, were accepted into the Hamburg Central Schools for a full-year internship which included methods courses. The Competency-Based Teacher Education program for student teachers provided the opportunity to develop teaching competencies in twelve categories. Methods courses were taught on-site by professors from SUC, Fredonia.

Under the direction of Dr. Daniel Wheeler, the program encouraged the 26 participating student teachers to relate competencies and educational concepts to their classroom experiences.

The Hamburg Center Intern Follow-up is one facet of a more comprehensive evaluation of the first year's activities. The interns were given an opportunity to respond to specific questions about their experiences and to reflect upon the Center approach to teacher preparation and "practice."

The instrument was designed to ascertain the effects of a field-centered competency-based teacher education program on the attitudes, academic backgrounds, employment prospects, and the professional growth of the interns. The instrument was composed of 45 items, which included 5 open-end items.

The instrument was field-tested by administering it to a sample of interns. A revised questionnaire was mailed in November, 1973, to all participating interns. To obtain a 100% return, follow-up telephone calls were made to graduates who did not respond to mailings. Within two months, 100% response was attained. Returns were coded to insure anonymity.

Suggestions and recommendations for improving the program, personal opinions, and comments were coded by area of concern and topic as forms were received. The questionnaire was divided into three sections by code: (C.A.) College-associated, (E) Employment, and (C) Center-oriented.

The investigators felt that interns' perceptions of the program would be one valuable measure of the effectiveness of the Center activities.

Chapter 2

The Study

Section One: College-Related Information

The information sought in the first section of the questionnaire was concerned with college-related data.

College affiliation. Of the 26 interns in the Hamburg Center project, 15 had also attended other colleges. Appendix A, page 20 indicates other colleges in which students had enrolled. One had attended 3 different colleges during summer sessions. Others had been enrolled at private colleges for part of their education. Community college was the original entry to the undergraduate program for 9 of the 15 who had attended other schools.

Table 1 indicates college enrollment categories.

Table 1. Colleges Attended by Interns

Type of College	N
SUC, Fredonia (4 yrs.)	10
SUC, Units (other than Fredonia)	2
Community College	9
Private College	8
Total	*29

*Multiple responses.

Academic minors. The majority of the interns (14) carried academic minors in the social sciences. Included in this total were 2 graduates with dual minors; one in mathematics and the other in Spanish.

Four persons in each area had English and mathematics minors. Included in this number was the mathematics and social science combination mentioned above. Two graduates earned music minors. A minor in art and one in history were awarded to two graduates. One intern received credit for a dual minor of psychology and sociology. Thus, the group who entered the Hamburg Center program were diversified in academic backgrounds.

Center information sources. The population under study had learned about the Center approach through a variety of sources. The largest number of students heard about the project through the Office of Field Experiences. Table 2 shows all sources of information and the number for each category listed.

Table 2. Hamburg Center Information Sources

Information Flow Categories	N
College Professor	1
Office of Field Experiences	14
Friend, Classmate	9
Communication Media	1
Center Faculty	3
Other	0
Total	*28

*Dual responses.

In response to the question, "Did you seek involvement in the Center?" 18 persons indicated that they did actively seek involvement.

Graduate school. All four people enrolled in graduate school listed reading as their major concentration.

Graduate Program Status	Number
Enrolled in graduate program	4
Enrolled at SUC, Fredonia	1
Full-time student	0

Intern reasons for choosing Center Program. Interns were frank in speaking out about why they chose the Center. There were 20 persons (77%) who expressed professional attitudes; personal reasons were expressed by 2 (8%); and a combination of professional and personal reasons was expressed by 4 (15%).

Personal reasons were given by two interns:

> Convenience and location.
>
> I didn't want to take methods.

Four interns gave a combination of personal and professional reasons:

> People said it would be much better for jobs. Didn't want to teach so thought this would give me a chance to decide for myself.
>
> Because of the tremendous amount of experience it offered, I was unimpressed with the traditional methods.
>
> Experience and closeness to home. Something new and exciting.

I couldn't get into the regular student-teaching program. Besides, the Office of Field Experience made it sound so good I couldn't resist.

Professional reasons for enrolling in the Hamburg Center, given by 20 interns, included these:

To avoid the separation of methods from classroom. (3)*

I felt I would get more teaching experience as well as professional criticisms.

Thought it would be enriching and a new opportunity. (2)*

The project sounded like a better form of preparing for a profession in teaching. (3)*

I was very impressed in the philosophy and attitudes of the program voiced by Bob Driscoll (former Director, Office of Field Experiences).

I feel it was more worthwhile than the usual method. (2)*

One full year of working with children. (2)*

Experience. (4)*

I thought it would help me in finding a job. (2)*

The students entering the Center program were, for the most part, professional in their selective processes. Aware of the different aspects of the "training period," the initial group of interns seemed to be eager candidates.

---

*The number in parenthesis indicates the total number of those who made similar comments.

Section Two: Center-Related Information

A section for ascertaining information with respect to the Hamburg Center activities was provided in the questionnaire. A three-point rating scale was used for fourteen questions. Opportunities to respond to three open-end items were also included in this section.

Indoctrination and methods. Of the target group, 16 (62%) felt that there was insufficient indoctrination into the Center program prior to assuming teaching duties.

Comments regarding coordination of college courses with classroom assignments were solicited. This idea was highly supported by 13 (50%) of the interns. However, several written responses were included which offered constructive suggestions (N = 12). Typical recommendations were:

> Just be sure that, once you schedule courses, keep them at that time for the rest of the semester.
>
> I think the professors should have made themselves more available to classroom participation than was the case. I myself was observed only twice through the first two practicums (advisor).
>
> Buying college texts is not necessary. Current paperbacks on the topic would be a better investment.
>
> Aid interns in developing files of ideas useful in the classroom.

Furthermore, 24 members (92%) of the group felt that discussion time for classroom situations during the practicum was, at least, adequate.

All but one of the target group welcomed the opportunity to work with three cooperating teachers to apply "methods" during their internships.

Use of academic minor. Material gleaned from academic minors was used frequently by 46% of those in the Hamburg program while 39% used the subject matter to "some" degree. Only 15% of the interns saw "little or no use" of their academic minors in the Center experience.

Specific aspects of a program. Reactions to suggestions for different school or district approaches are illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3. Categories of Center Experiences

Statements Regarding Center	Very Much		Some		Little or Not at All		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Center provision for putting theory into practice.	14	54	12	46	0	0		
Use of methods material strengthened by working with 3 cooperating teachers.	18	69	7	27	1	4		
Degree to which Center staff helped in securing of a position.	1	4	7	27	16	62	2	7
Degree of opportunities for individual conferences with college staff.	8	31	16	62	2	7		
Degree of opportunities for professional relationships with college professors.	9	34	13	50	3	12	1	4
Degree of application of academic minor to classroom situations.	12	46	10	39	4	15		
Degree of incorporation of classroom "situations" to method class discussions.	15	58	9	35	2	7		

Table 3 (Continued).

Statements Regarding Center	Very Much		Some		Little or Not at All		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Degree to which involvement in Center approach would be encouraged to others.	18	69	7	27	1	4		
Degree to which 2 student teaching situations in different schools would be endorsed.	7	27	5	20	14	53		
Degree to which 2 student teaching situations in 2 different school systems would be endorsed.	6	23	12	46	8	31		
Degree of sufficient indoctrination prior to assuming teaching duties.	3	12	7	26	16	62		
Degree to which 1/2 year internship following professional semester is considered adequate to teacher preparation.	1	4	12	46	12	46	1	4
Degree to which exclusion from kindergarten situation affected individual.	3	12	4	15	16	61	3	12
Degree to which competency-based Center program clarified perceptions of scope and depth of teaching.	8	31	14	53	3	12	1	4

The results of an open-end item on different approaches follow:

16 in favor of different situations

1 in favor of the center project

2 recorded positive features of each plan

19 participants who responded to "open-end" item.

Typical of the comments which favored a variety of teaching situations were:

> It would broaden your scope of different type of school systems.
>
> By seeing different systems, you are able to compare and evaluate each system. I think this should be part of the program.

Indicative of the mixed response, was this statement:

> I feel that the experience in three different situations in one school was very good and allowed a student teacher to experience (that of) a normal teaching full-year schedule. However, the experience in more than one school could give a student teacher a comparison of different schools' habits and systems, which is an important factor since no two schools operate the same.

The teaching experience of the Hamburg Center program was exemplified by this statement:

> You do not become integrated into faculty when you are switching schools.

The interns' perceptions of the competency-based Center program varied. There were 22 participants (85%) who approved of the idea, at least to some extent.

Comments on the competency-based Center were made through an open-end item, by 20 (77%) of the interns. Positive and constructive statements were made by 12 (46%) of those participating in the Center project; 4 (15%) made negative or critical comments, while the remaining 4 (15%) made statements which contained elements of both a positive and negative nature.

Positive reinforcement was given by statements such as:

> As an intern, I knew just what was expected. If you weren't 100% successful the first time, you could try again.
>
> The wide scope of competencies helped to prepare me more from week to week, from situation to situation.

After the item, "To what degree did the competency-based Center program clarify your perception of the scope and depth of teaching? How?" several interns clarified their ideas. The distribution of comments is indicated below:

Positive Reinforcement	Negative Statement	Mixed (1+2)	No Response	Total
12	4	4	6	26

Examples of positive reinforcement statements were:

> It identified exactly what was expected of you and any vagueness was usually clarified.
>
> Instead of just doing various things, you had a reason.
>
> I became aware of the true role of the teacher. I was put into the situation of teaching as if it was my class and the children's education was my responsibility. Listening and reading about teaching for three years in a classroom does not make a teacher. The one year of internship taught me much more than my previous three years of preparation. Working with children and the co-operating teachers taught me to understand processes, personalities, and all that goes into this profession.

Typical of the negative reactions were:

> They were so hard to understand.
>
> It made me realize that teaching wasn't for me.

Mixed comments included this type of statement:

> I was forced to relate actions to the competencies and would see more clearly reasons for doing things. I did get frustrated feeling them out though.
>
> Good idea but I feel as though someone is either competent or not.

College staff-intern relationships. Most of the target group felt that they had opportunities, to a degree, for professional relationships with college professors.

There were 9 (34%) interns who stated that they had opportunity for individual conferences with college professors.

Table 4. Reactions to Practical Aspects of Center Experiences

Center Educational Categories	Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sufficient feedback and observation on lessons by college personnel.	13	50	9	35	4	15
Sufficient feedback and observation on lessons by cooperating teachers.	17	65	5	20	4	15
Proper channels were open to discuss and react to problems.	17	65	4	15	5	20
Schedules of college classes and classroom assignments were co-ordinated.	13	50	8	30	5	20
Ideas were shared on coordinating these activities.	8	31	12	46	6	23

Section Three: Employment Information

A third section of the instrument dealt with employment.

The picture. Negative comments about employment possiblities are heard everywhere. As the communication media often proclaim, college graduates are caught up in the economic crunch with everyone else. The teaching profession was no exception; the field was, and is, saturated.

Of the 26 interns who were enrolled in the first year's program, 21 (81%) actively sought employment. There were 3 of that number who initially sought nonprofessional positions. This left 18 persons (69%) in the teaching field who were applying for positions.

Strategy. The Placement Office at SUC, Fredonia, had 24 (92%) who registered from the Hamburg program. Of that number, there were 21 (81%) who received information about employment possibilities through the Placement Office. Unsolicited comments were made by 3 (11%) of the target group concerning whether they had been helped by registering at the Placement Office. The statements were:

> Always too late (at least 1 month behind).
>
> Yes--didn't make application to any of the possibilities since I wanted to work near Westfield.
>
> Yes--but not for the job I got.

Furthermore, professors suggested potential jobs to 8 interns.

A college degree was felt to be beneficial in securing employment by 13 (50%).

Table 5. Employment Strategies

Employment Information	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Actively sought employment.	21	81	5	19
Initially sought nonprofessional position.	3	12	23	88
Registered at Placement Office.	24	92	2	8
Employment possibilities through Placement.	21	81	5	19
Employment possibilities from professors.	8	31	18	69

Present status. How did interns in the Hamburg Center project, an innovative program, fare in the job market?

There were 14 of the 18 (72%) prospective teachers who found positions. Full-time assignments were secured by 10. There were 4 (15%) who had part-time or substitute positions.

Table 6. Employment: Status and Related Items

Categories Items Related to Employment	Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Currently employed.	24	92	2	8	-	-
Currently employed in teaching.	14	54	12	46	-	-
College contacts instrumental in securing position.	3	12	21	81	2*	8
Earned degree beneficial to employment.	13	50	11	42	2*	8
Center experience beneficial to employment.	9	35	14	54	3*	12
College experience helpful in present position.	17	65	6	23	3*	12
Relatives/friends with same employer	7	27	16	62	3*	12
Anticipated 2 years at present position.	9	35	10	39	7*	27

*(2) undergraduates in program.

Other employment categories included a variety of positions. There were 21 interns (81%) who actively sought employment. By the Spring of 1974, 24 (92%) of the group were employed. Interns of the Hamburg Center Project faired very well in the job market.

Table 7 provides Professional Information on the use of training materials by teaching respondents.

Table 7. Professional Use of Training Procedures by Teaching Respondents (N = 13)

Professional Use of Training	Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Use of Course Projects in Classroom.	9	69	3	23	1	8
Teaching a Grade Level of Internship.	3	23	8	62	2	15
Academic Minor Helpful to Teacher Role.	10	77	3	23	0	0

Appendix B, page 20, indicates grade level of teaching assignment.

Section Four: Personal Comments

The target group accepted the opportunity to express their reactions in a section for unrestricted responses which were solicited at the end of the questionnaire. They reacted openly and freely.

A majority of interns 19 (74%) included statements which were classified into five categories: (1) Constructive, (2) Critical, (3) Mixed, (4) Neutral, and (5) No Comment.

Categories of Responses

	N	%
Constructive	11	42
Critical	6	23
Mixed	1	4
Neutral	1	4
No Comment	7	26
Total	26	100

A cross section of the comments are listed below.

In the area of constructive comments, responses included:

> I feel that this is the best way for anyone to gain the experience necessary for teaching. I went into this year of teaching confident and eager to work with many of the usual fears long since solved through the program.
>
> During the program I thought it was hard and long, but now that I look back I feel it was the most rewarding and unforgettable experience in my college life.
>
> I was very pleased to be part of the Hamburg Project. It left me with a great deal of experience and confidence.

My present employer was very impressed with my student teaching. He feels it is a step in the right direction. In fact, he feels many of my ideas are due to the good program I was in.

Examples of critical comments included:

Throughout my full year I had no professors in my classroom to observe and criticize my teaching skills.

Need better method for teaching evaluation instead of #1 2 3 4 5 (circle one). It was not established what criteria were to be met in order to achieve a "5."

The major disadvantage was the P/F system. I thought that these would be more personal evaluations which could have added a special touch to my placement papers.

The Center was helpful to a point, but one has to be made of "iron" to participate.

The mixed response:

Personally, I got a lot out of the Hamburg experience but throughout the year there were a lot of intensive situations because of friction in philosophy between Hamburg and Fredonia State University. Despite drawbacks, the philosophy of student teaching for a year is very worthwhile.

The neutral response stated:

Most of the questions are not applicable because upon graduation . . . I never sought employment.

Chapter 3

Retrospect

Although people react to pilot programs in a variety of ways, the interns were enthusiastic in their overall acceptance of the situation. They endorsed the Center concept and recommended the program to other students. Their perceptions of how other groups viewed the program were solicited in response to the following item: "Do you feel that the 'Hawthorne' effect of the Center approach was apparent in the attitude of the following: SUC, faculty, Center staff, parents/relatives and potential employers?"

The interns indicated a positive attitude to the "Hawthorne" effect (a new, unique situation) by a majority of persons in each category.

A brief summary of the program was provided by the person who said,

> We were able to have quite a wide range of experiences in this year's situation so that, I think, we not only are aware of the glamour of the teaching profession but also of the hard work, long hours, and, most importantly, the responsibility we have to our students.

Appendices

Appendix A

Colleges, other than Fredonia, attended by interns.

SUC Units	Community Colleges	Private Colleges
Binghamton (1)*	Auburn (1)	Gannon (1)
Brockport (1)	Genesee (2)	Hilbert (2)
	Jamestown (1)	Hofstra (1) S.S.
	Mohawk (1)	Niagara University (1)
	Nassau (1) S.S.**	Rosary Hill (1)
	Niagara (2)	C. W. Post (1)
	Suffolk (1)	University of Miami (1)

*(number) indicates the number attending designated school.

**S.S. indicates attendance during a summer session.

Appendix B

The grade/level of the teaching assignment of interns.

Level/Grade Assignment	N(14)*
Nursery/kindergarten	2*
Kindergarten-Third levels	1
Third grade	4
Fourth grade	2
Sixth grade	4
No response	1

*YWCA Day Care Center included.

Appendix C

CENTER PROJECT

INTERN QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER_____

BIRTH DATE_____ SEX _____

DIRECTIONS. Please check (x) applicable items.

C.A. 1. Was Fredonia the only college that you attended? Yes__ No__

If not, what other college did you attend? _____

2. What was your academic minor? _____

3. How did you originally hear about the Center approach?

a) College professor ___

b) Office of Field Experiences ___

c) Friend or classmate ___

d) Communication media ___

e) Center faculty ___

f) Other ___

If other, how? _____

4. Did you seek involvement in the Center? Yes__ No__

5. Are you presently enrolled in graduate school? (If answer is Yes, please answer the following). Yes__ No__

a. If so, are you enrolled at Fredonia? Yes__ No__

b. What is the major concentration for graduate work? _____

_____

c. Are you a full-time student? Yes__ No__

6. Did you seek employment during (or upon completing) the Center program? Yes___ No___

7. Did you initially seek a position outside your chosen profession? Yes___ No___

8. Are you currently employed? Yes___ No___

9. Where are you employed?

10. Did you register at the Placement Center in Fredonia? Yes___ No___

11. Did you receive information about employment possibilities through the Placement Center of the College? Yes___ No___

12. Did you receive information about employment possibilities from individual professors? Yes___ No___

13. Did you get a position because of College contacts? Yes___ No___

14. Did a degree help you gain employment? Yes___ No___

15. Did your Center experience help you secure a position? Yes___ No___

16. Have your college experiences helped in your present position? Yes___ No___

17. Do you have relatives or close friends with the same employer as yours? Yes___ No___

18. Do you anticipate remaining with your employer for at least two years? Yes___ No___

If you are employed by a school system, please answer the following.

19. Are you able to adjust "methods" projects to your classroom? Yes___ No___

20. Are you teaching at the grade level of one of your intern experiences? Yes___ No___

21. Are you satisfied that your academic minor is helpful to you as a teacher? Yes___ No___

22. At what level or grade are you teaching?

_____

C. 23. Were you observed and given sufficient feedback on lessons by: college personnel? Yes___ No___
cooperating teachers? Yes___ No___

24. If a problem occurred, were proper channels available for discussion and action? Yes___ No___

25. Were the schedules of college courses and classroom assignments coordinated? Yes___ No___

26. Do you have ideas to share about co-ordinating these activities? (see 25) Yes___ No___

27. What are your ideas?
(Use the back of sheet if needed)

28. Do you feel that the Hawthorne effect (a new, unique situation accepted favorably) of the Center approach was apparent in the attitudes of the following?

SUC, faculty	Yes___	No___
Center staff	Yes___	No___
Parents/relatives	Yes___	No___
Potential employers	Yes___	No___

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the number of the rating scale which applies to the following items:

1 - very much
2 - some
3 - little or not at all

29.	To what extent did the Center provide opportunities to put "theory" into practice?	1	2	3
30.	To what extent did the opportunity to work with 3 cooperating teachers strengthen the opportunity to apply "methods" course material?	1	2	3
31.	To what degree did staff at the Center help you secure a position?	1	2	3
~~32.~~	To what degree were there opportunities for individual conferences with college staff?	1	2	3
33.	To what degree were you provided opportunities for professional relationships with college professors?	1	2	3
34.	To what degree were you able to apply your academic minor to classroom situations?	1	2	3
35.	To what degree were you able to incorporate classroom situations with discussions during methods classes?	1	2	3
36.	To what extent would you encourage other students to become involved in a Center approach?	1	2	3
37.	To what degree do you feel that 2 student teaching situations in different schools for a total of one year, would have been more beneficial to you?	1	2	3
38.	To what degree do you feel that 2 student teaching situations in different school systems for a total of one year, would have been more beneficial to you?	1	2	3

39. How? _____

40. How sufficient was your indoctrination to the program, prior to assuming teaching duties? 1 2 3

41. To what degree do you feel a 1/2-year internship, following your professional semester, would be adequate for teacher preparation? 1 2 3

42. For what reasons did you choose the Hamburg Project?

_____

43. To what extent did the exclusion of the opportunity to be assigned to a kindergarten situation affect you? 1 2 3

44. To what degree did the competency-based Center program clarify your perceptions of the scope and depth of teaching? 1 2 3

How? _____

This space is reserved for your personal comments.

HMcK:GR